

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 DARREN HARRIS, Case No. 1:05-cv-00003-AWI-SKO (PC)
11 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
12 v. FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS, WITH
13 KIM, et al., (Docs. 126 and 128)
14 Defendants

17 || I. Procedural History

18 Plaintiff Darren Harris, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this
19 civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on January 3, 2005. This action is proceeding on
20 Plaintiff's fourth amended complaint against Defendants Olivarria, Williams, and Kim for
21 violation of the Eighth Amendment, and against Defendants Olivarria and Lowden for violation of
22 the First Amendment.

23 | A. Order on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel

24 On November 26, 2013, the Court issued a twelve-page order granting in part and denying
25 in part Plaintiff's motion to compel. Defendants were ordered to serve supplemental responses
26 within thirty days; the meet and confer requirement was re-imposed on the parties; Plaintiff was
27 ordered to notify Defendants' counsel within fifteen days of receipt of the supplemental responses
28 if he was dissatisfied with any of them; Defendants' counsel was ordered to arrange an in-person

1 or telephonic meeting within fifteen days of receiving a letter of dissatisfaction from Plaintiff; and
2 Plaintiff was granted one-hundred five days within which to file a motion to compel, if one was
3 necessary. The order was clear regarding the parties' obligations and the limited relief available to
4 Plaintiff with respect to this final round of discovery.

5 Based on the parties' subsequent filings, discussed in section B, Plaintiff was dissatisfied
6 with some of the supplemental responses and he sent counsel a letter on January 5, 2014. Counsel
7 responded by letter dated January 27, 2014, and offered to arrange a telephone conference if
8 needed. Ultimately, the parties conferred by telephone on February 13, 2014.

9 **B. Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions**

10 On January 31, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking sanctions against Defendants'
11 counsel under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11. Defendants filed an opposition on February 18,
12 2014, and on March 6, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion to strike the opposition, which the Court
13 construes as Plaintiff's reply in light of the fact that Plaintiff's disagreement with Defendants'
14 response provides no basis for striking the filing.¹ *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f); Sidney-Vinstein v.*
15 *A.H. Robins Co.*, 697 F.2d 880, 885 (9th Cir. 1983). Plaintiff's motion for Rule 11 sanctions has
16 been submitted upon the record without oral argument and for the reasons which follow, it is
17 denied with prejudice. Local Rule 230(l).

18 **II. Discussion and Order**

19 "Rule 11 is intended to deter baseless filings in district court and imposes a duty of
20 'reasonable inquiry' so that anything filed with the court is 'well grounded in fact, legally tenable,
21 and not interposed for any improper purpose.'" *Islamic Shura Council of Southern California v.*
22 *F.B.I.*, __ F.3d __, __ No. 12-55305, 2014 WL 1013324, at *__ (9th Cir. Mar. 18, 2014) (per
23 curiam) (quoting *Cooter & Gell v. Hartmax Corp.*, 496 U.S. 384, 393, 110 S.Ct. 2447 (1990)).

24 Plaintiff's Rule 11 motion fails as a matter of law. First, Plaintiff is dissatisfied with
25 counsel over the supplemental discovery responses and compliance with the meet and confer

26 ¹ Plaintiff's reply is twenty-one pages long and includes such irrelevant issues as Plaintiff's settlement demand. The
27 Court does not reach the arguments therein because: 1) Plaintiff did not meet his initial burden as the party moving for
28 sanctions under Rule 11, and 2) pursuant to the order of November 26, 2013, Plaintiff was limited to seeking relief
from the Court in the form of a motion to compel. Plaintiff was not granted leave to lay at the feet of the Court issues
with the parties' meet and confer attempts.

1 requirement. Thus, there is no purportedly baseless filing with the Court, a necessary
2 underpinning for a Rule 11 motion. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b). Second, Plaintiff's motion was filed in
3 violation of the twenty-one day "safe harbor provision," a provision which is strictly enforced.
4 Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c)(2); *Holgate v. Baldwin*, 425 F.3d 671, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2005).

5 For these reasons, Plaintiff's Rule 11 motion, filed on January 31, 2014, is HEREBY
6 DENIED, with prejudice.

7
8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: March 24, 2014

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
11
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28